

Serial No. 09/938,447, filed August 24, 2001
Docket No. 1140668-0024
Page 6 of 10

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. STATUS OF THE PENDING CLAIMS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 11 has been amended to address an error of a typographical nature and claims 12-17 and 19-20 have been amended to address incorrectly numbered dependent claims. These amendments add no new subject matter.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-11, 13-14, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,414,494 to Aikens et al. ("Aikens") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,567,502 to Zellner et al. ("Zellner"). Claims 2, 9, 12, 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Aikens in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,374,112 to Widegren et al. ("Widegren").

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claim 1 has been amended and is now respectfully submitted to be in allowable form.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-11, 12-14, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Aikens in view of Zellner.

A rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) requires a showing that each and every claim limitation be identically disclosed in a single prior art reference, either expressly or under the principles of inherency. See Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp., 713 F.2d 760, 772 (Fed. Cir.

Serial No. 09/938,447, filed August 24, 2001
Docket No. 1140668-0024
Page 7 of 10

1983), cert. denied, 465 U.S. 1026 (1984). If even one claim limitation is not described in the reference, the claim is patentable over the reference.

The Examiner has improperly rejected claims 1, 3-8, 10-11, 13-14, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) on the basis of both Aikens and Zellner. Regardless, neither Aikens nor Zellner, whether alone or in combination, disclose each and every claim limitation of the rejected claims. Moreover, without the benefit of hindsight reliance on the present application, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been reasonably motivated to combine these references, which relate to completely different technical fields. Aikens is purportedly directed to the automatic notification to remote devices in response to machine conditions. Zellner, on the other hand, is purportedly directed to a system and method of remotely controlling one or more monitoring devices in a user's household in the event of an emergency.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10

Even if the references were combined, Aikens and Zellner, together, do not identically disclose each element of claims 1 and 11 and all claims depending from these claims. Aikens, which is cited for allegedly disclosing the limitations of claim 1, does not disclose, amongst other claimed features, (1) a control device for providing multimedia monitoring, (2) a processor for processing control data and for processing multimedia information regarding a monitored status of a remote machine or (3) a multimedia connection coupled to a processor providing a multimedia transmission connection to the remote machine and transmitting said multimedia information regarding a monitored status of the remote machine.

The Examiner admits that Aikens does not teach a processor. Instead, the Examiner argues that Aikens allegedly describes a computer provided at a host machine. This computer, however, performs none of the functions as claimed and described above. Aikens, at best, purportedly discloses a machine that sends data from the machine to a remote host. (See Aikens, at col. 6, lines 8-11, 20-23; col. 7, lines 4-13; col. 10, lines 49-55.) Once the remote machine has received information, a visual or audio indicator, such as a blinking light or an audio alarm, can allegedly be activated to alert the operator at the remote receiving station. (See Aikens, at col.

Serial No. 09/938,447, filed August 24, 2001

Docket No. 1140668-0024

Page 8 of 10

10, lines 1-3.) This, however, does not teach or even suggest a multimedia transmission connection for transmitting *multimedia information* as claimed and described in the application.

Moreover, the office action does not cite Zellner for these limitations and, in fact, Zellner does not recite these limitations. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and therefore all claims depending from claim 1, are patentable over Aikens in view of Zellner.

Claims 11-14, 18, 20

Claim 11 recites, amongst other limitations, providing multimedia monitoring using a control device coupled to a processor, processing information generated by a monitored remote machine, generating multimedia information regarding a monitored status of the remote machine and providing a multimedia connection coupled to a processor providing a multimedia transmission connection to the monitored remote machine and transmitting the multimedia information. The office action cites Aikens in view of Zellner to reject this claim. As stated above, Aikens does not disclose any of these claimed features.

Furthermore, by relying on Zellner as allegedly teaching the step of processing information generated by the monitored remote machine, the office action implies that Aikens, alone, does not disclose this method step. Zellner allegedly discloses a system and method for monitoring a user's vicinity but does not disclose or suggest processing or generating information about the status of a remote machine or providing a multimedia transmission connection.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11, and all claims depending from claim 11, are patentable over Aikens in view of Zellner.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2, 9, 12, 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Aikens in view of Widegren.

4/20/2006 8:07 PM (7K)

Serial No. 09/938,447, filed August 24, 2001

Docket No. 1140668-0024

Page 9 of 10

As stated above, Aikens does not disclose all the elements of claim 1. Because the office action does not cite Widegren as disclosing the elements of claim 1, claims 2 and 9, which depend from claim 1, are not unpatentable over Aikens in view of Widegren. Moreover, because the office action does not cite Widegren as disclosing the elements of claim 11, claims 12, 15-17, and 19, which depend from claim 11, are not unpatentable over Aikens in view of Widegren.

The combination of the applied references, moreover, is respectfully submitted to be improper. Aikens is purportedly directed to the automatic notification to remote devices in response to machine conditions. Widegren, on the other hand, allegedly discloses flexible radio access and resource allocation in a universal mobile telephone system. Because Aikens and Widegren relate to completely different technical fields, one of ordinary skill in the field of interactive remote processor control could not reasonably be expected to combine these references. Doing so would require the benefit of hindsight reliance on the present application.

Claims 2, 9, 12, 15-17 and 19 are therefore respectfully submitted to recite allowable subject matter.

CONCLUSION


Claims 1-20, as amended, are pending in the application. Applicants submit that all of the pending claims, for the reasons set forth above, recite patentable subject matter and are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are therefore respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/938,447, filed August 24, 2001
Docket No. 1140668-0024
Page 10 of 10

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any required fee, to Deposit Account No. 23-1703.

Dated: April 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Scott T. Weingaertner
Reg. No. 37,756
Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 007470
White & Case LLP
Direct Line: (212) 819-8404